

A Plain
Scripture-Argument

AGAINST

Dr. *Clark's* DOCTRINE

Concerning the
Ever-Blessed TRINITY;

Clarke (S)
K

IN A
Letter to Dr. CLARK;

With some previous Letters, relating to our Creeds, and Forms of Worship:

BY THE

Collector of the Texts, *in a Book, intitled*, Several Hundred Texts of Holy Scripture, plainly proving, that our Lord Jesus Christ is the most High God.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *M. Lawrence* in the Poultry, and
J. Downing in Bartholomew-Close near
West-Smithfield. 1715.

Price Six-pence.

Scripture-Argument

Dr. Clark's Doctrine

Ever-Riched

Letter to Dr. Clark



Printed for the Author, by J. W. & A. ...
... in ...
...
...

T H E P R E F A C E.

THE Scripture-Argument against Dr. Clark's Doctrine concerning the Holy Trinity, contain'd in the III^d Letter to him in these following Papers, is recommended for its plainness, and easiness to be understood by every private Christian. I do not by using it, any ways distrust the positive Proofs that are brought for the Eternal Deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, from those Texts in which it is directly revealed; such as 1 Joh. v. 7. Phil. ii. 6. Rom. ix. 5. Joh. x. 30. Tit. ii. 13. 1 Joh. v. 20. and many more. When the Scriptures are studied with a humble Mind, there goes a mighty Power and Efficacy with them, to enlighten the Eyes: But when Artifices are used to darken this Light; and the Authority of one Text is denied; and a contrary Translation of another is introduc'd; when various Readings and Pointings are pretended in the rest: when in some the Construction of the Words, and in others the plainest Sense is disputed; there is no Doctrine so fully reveal'd, but by these Methods, it may be made to seem uncertain and doubtful. Many are preserved, by the Grace of God, from the stumbling-blocks laid in their Way; and Learned Men are enabled to extricate themselves from these Difficulties, and to convince the Gainsayers, by vindicating the Authority, Translation, and Reading, together with the Construction and Sense of the Texts, on which they

ground the Doctrines of Christianity. But the common People, whose Souls are as precious to Him that purchas'd them, as the Souls of the most learned Critics, have not opportunity to search into, nor ability to make a Judgment of the Performances of these Learned Men on either side: And it is not the Will of our Father which is in Heaven, that one of these little ones should perish, through ignorance of these fundamental Truths, or through Errors contrary thereunto, for want of this kind of Learning. I cannot therefore but think, that He, whose Will it is that the Poor should have the Gospel preached to them, has given us ways suitable to their capacities, to establish them in the Truths thereof; that they may understandingly make Profession of the Faith, and seriously join in the Worship of the Christian Church. As to the present Controversie about the Doctrine of the Trinity, in which our Profession of Faith, and Order of Worship, are so nearly concern'd, there are two Things seem necessary to be done, for them who are not able to contend about divers Readings and Criticisms; but bless God for the good Translation of the Scripture, which they have, in a Tongue which they understand. The one, to answer the Pretence of Scripture that is made for this new Scheme; and the other, to give a plain Scripture Argument for the Truth that they have been taught.

It cannot be deny'd, that Dr. Clarke makes a Pretence to Scripture. He entitles his Book, The Scripture Doctrine; and there is in it a large Collection of Scriptures of the New Testament: And in his Reply to Mr. Nelson, p. 26. He seems to complain, "That his Answerer had taken no notice of
 " above 300 Texts, in which all he contends for is
 " as clearly express'd, as they can be express'd in
 " Words." This sounds great; and certainly requires an Answer, which may be easie to common Capacities. What he contends for, I have set down
 from

from his own Book, in the following Letter the III^d. and that (I humbly conceive) is so far from being express'd in 300 Texts, that there is no one Text in the Holy Scriptures to prove it. It is true indeed, that the Texts which he cites do prove, that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, is in a certain Sense, (well known and own'd by all Christians) subordinate and inferior to the Father; that He has received Authority and Power from Him; and that He acts according to the Will of the Father; mediates and intercedes with Him on our behalf, and the like. But there is one plain distinction, well known amongst Christians also, which shews that these 300 Texts are perfectly agreeable with our Doctrine of the strictly-eternal Deity of our Saviour, and so make nothing for what he contends for. This distinction this Learned Man is no ways ignorant of; for he has quoted it from Bishop Bull, in his Book, p. 357. and rendered it into English in these Words: "Our Lord Christ may be considered in two Respects, either as God or as God-man, and Mediator between God and Man. If we consider our Saviour in this latter respect, it appears from many Places of Scripture, and the consent of all Christians, that all the Worship, which we pay to God, ought to be directed to Him through Christ our Mediator; and that all the Worship and Honour, which we pay to Christ, ought to redound to God the Father, (as St. Paul speaks, Phil. ii.) for that Christ is, in respect of both his Natures, the Mediator between God and Man, (whatever some of the Romanists urge to the contrary) is the unanimous Doctrine of the Ancient Catholick Fathers, and of the Holy Scriptures." We have sufficient proof, that the Son of God is of the same Substance with the Father, by whom all Things [all Beings] were made; but the main Design of the new Testament is to represent Him, as the Christ, the great Emmanuel; that as the reasonable Soul and
Flesh

vi The P R E F A C E.

Flesh are one Man, so God and Man is one Christ; *He is declared to be God manifested in the Flesh; the Word made Flesh; and with respect to this, God is represented as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; who is said to anoint Him with the Holy Spirit, which He received without measure, and by which He acted in subordination to the Father, and through Him we have access by one Spirit to the Father. So that we are to distinguish between the Trinity of Persons in the Divine Nature, and the Manifestation of the Trinity in the Christian Oeconomy or Dispensation; and the latter is depending upon the former. The Trinity of Persons is natural and necessary to the Divine Being, without which He were not that God which He is; but the Manifestation of the Trinity in the Christian Dispensation, is arbitrary, of his own Free-will, (call'd his good Will towards Men,) being upon the Account, that the Son of God did voluntarily assume the Nature of Man, and freely took upon Himself the Office of a Mediator between God and Man. He might have been the same God that He is, (and have govern'd his Creatures too) though He had never manifested Himself after this manner, to the fallen Race of Man, as the New Testament now represents Him to have done. This Revelation is particularly for the Use of Man, that we might address our Selves to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, for the Spirit of Revelation in the Knowledge of Him, Eph. i. 17. and our Creeds and Forms of Worship are compos'd agreeably to this manifestation of the Trinity; we are to draw near to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in Him Our Father; through the Merits and Mediation of his only Son our Saviour; by the Help and Assistance of his Holy Spirit, which He hath given us. This gracious Dispensation depending upon the voluntary Condescension of the Son of God, to take our Nature, and the Office of a Mediator*

The P R E F A C E. vii

diator upon Him, does no ways contradict our Doctrine of his being of the same Substance or Essence with the Father; but does indeed depend upon that His Eternal Deity; for though Dr. Cl—— in his last Letter seems to think it strange, that He should be one with God, whom He mediates to; yet this is, because He does not distinguish between the essential and personal Properties of the Deity which are by necessity of Nature; and what is done by the Blessed God of his own Free-will, or by the voluntary Consent of the three glorious Persons in the Godhead. The Son's being sent into the World by the Father, his mediating with the Father, &c. did not, by the eternal Necessity of Nature, flow from the Deity, nor from the proper or peculiar Personalities therein, nor yet from both together; but from the voluntary Consent and Agreement of the Three Divine Persons, that the Second Person should assume the Humane Nature, and suffer in that Nature for the Sins of Men, and mediate with the Father for lost Sinners. This was matter of free Grace; it was possible in the nature of the Thing, that it might never have been; though being once agreed on, it was necessary (upon that supposition only) that it should be. The humane Nature so assumed was the only physical Principle of the Sufferings of the Mediator; the Divine Nature did indeed support the Humane Nature, and give virtue, value, and efficacy to the Sufferings, but did not at all physically suffer, (which is impossible) but only reputatively [is reputed so to do;] because it is the Humane Nature so wonderfully united to the Son of God that so suffer'd. So far then (as I said) is this from opposing the Doctrine of the Son's eternal Deity, that it wholly depends upon it, without which He could never have accomplished this work of Mediation. "The Sacrifice of Christ God-man, " (as one well saith) was defective in nothing; was " both suitable and equal to the Exigency of the " Case: for the Sacrifice of Him that was Man
" was

" was suitable to the Offence of Man ; and of Him
 " that was God, was equal to the wrong done to
 " God." This indeed does not weigh much with Dr.
 Clarke. He saith, in his Answer to the 1st Let-
 ter of one of his Friends, in a Book entituled, Three
 Letters to Dr. Clark, p. 17. Satisfaction cannot
 be proved to be in it self, and in the Nature of
 Things, necessary ; but what the offended Per-
 son thinks fit to require and accept, that's the
 true Satisfaction. This seems to me the making of
 Christ to die in vain. The Apostle saith, It is not
 possible for the Blood of Bulls and Goats to take
 away Sin : But according to this Doctrine, it might
 have been possible, that even a less Charge than such
 numerous Sacrifices put them to, might have been ac-
 cepted for a Satisfaction. The Design of God is
 plainly higher than he imagines ; viz. to have a
 Propitiation — to declare his Righteousness,
 that he may be just, and the justifier of them
 that believe in Jesus, Rom. iii. 25, 26. This sin-
 gular Way of shewing himself just, by this grand
 Propitiation, does admirably declare the Honour of
 his Law and Government, before myriads of Angels
 and intellectual Creatures, that stand in continual awe
 of Him. It is well express'd by a late Writer,
 " The Wrong done to the Majesty of Heaven was
 " such, that the whole Creation consuming in an uni-
 " versal Flame, had been an unproportionable Sacri-
 " fice ; it were manifestly more honourable and wor-
 " thy of God, not to have exacted any satisfaction
 " at all, than to have accepted, under the Notion of
 " a Sacrifice, such as were unproportionable, and
 " beneath the Value of what was to be remitted and
 " conferr'd : What is less than God, is infinitely
 " less ; bring the Honour and Majesty of the Deity
 " to any thing less than an equal Value, and you
 " bring it to nothing. This had been to make the
 " Majesty of Heaven cheap, and depreciate the
 " Dignity of the divine Government, instead of ren-
 " dring

"bring it August and Great." Thus do the many hundred Texts, quoted by Dr. Clarke, relating to the Son's being a Mediator with the Father, admirably agree with the Doctrine of His strictly-eternal Deity; which therefore shews forth the wonderful Grace and Condescension of the Son of God, and the Value and Efficacy of his Mediation.

But it is not enough that we give an Answer to the Pretence of Scripture for the Opposite Doctrine, unless we establish our own by plain Scripture Proof, viz. that the Son of God is of one Substance with the Father, and by consequence, that the one God is not one Person, but three Persons in one Substance. (Col. for Trinity Sunday in the Communion Service.) To prove this, it was formerly thought sufficient to shew, that the Titles, Attributes, and Worship, that belong to the most High God, are in Scripture ascribed to the Son of God; and when this was made appear, the Doctrine of one only Divine Being having been before firmly established amongst Christians, they presently concluded that the Son must be the same Divine Being with the Father and the Holy Ghost; or that they were the same One God. But now Dr. Clarke has made a Distinction of several distinct Divine Beings; and he is willing to ascribe Divine Titles, and Attributes, and Worship, to the Son of God; but not in the same Manner, and in the same Sense, in which they are ascribed to the supreme God. In his Scripture Doctrine, p. 298. he ascribes to the Son, all divine Powers, excepting absolute Supremacy and Independency, which, (adds he,) to suppose communicable, is an express Contradiction in Terms. And very true it is, to suppose the Supremacy and Independency of God to be communicated to any other Beings, is a Contradiction. But if Independency be an essential Attribute of God, and the Father has communicated his undivided Essence to the Son by an eternal Generation,

that He is of one Substance or Essence with Him ; then is He the same Independent Being, whom we call the one God, and must have the same Supremacy over all other Beings, which are created and made. For the Proof of this is this Scripture-Argument brought, which follows in these Papers, viz. that this Supreme Independent Being has declared that there are no other Beings, inferior or dependent, to whom Divine Titles, Attributes, or Worship, do or ought to belong, or to be ascribed : and by consequence, that the Son of God (to whom it is confess'd that Divine Titles, Attributes, and Worship do belong) is indeed a distinct Person from the Father and the Holy Ghost in the same Essence ; but is not another Being, but of one and the same Substance with the Father and the Holy Ghost.

In my management of this Argument, I hope it will not be thought unfair, that I have printed some short Letters of Dr. Clarke's, which may be suppos'd to be sent to me, as to a Friend, for my own private Use. It is to be considered, that I never had the Honour of any Correspondence with the Doctor, upon any other account than of our difference about this Doctrine ; nor did I ever see his Face, (that I know of) but when once he favoured me with some discourse on this subject at his Bookseller's. I have all along had the Unhappiness to be treated as an Adversary, (though, I own with civility and candour.) But my chief Reason for publishing these Letters is, that they are my Vouchers that I have done all that in me lies, to try whether there be any thing more to be said against my Scripture-Argument, than what I have presented the Reader with, and made my Reply to : I was sincerely desirous to know whether there was any flaw in my Reasoning, that I might amend it. It is with great respect to the Doctor, (whom for many of his Accomplishments I greatly esteem) that I laid my Argument before him two several times, at more than 12 Months distance between them, that he might
make

make his Objections against it, as fully as he pleas'd ; I knew no better way to be assured of the Strength of my Argument before I published it, (which for about two Years I have been designing to do) than to lay it fairly by way of Letter before him, who first published the opposite Doctrine ; and now the Argument is so interwoven with the Replies to his Answers, that I cannot well publish the one without the other. Had I printed this Scripture-Argument, without taking notice of his Answer, I had fallen into the same Fault, that my first Letter complains of in him : And I knew of no better way of setting down his Answer, than in his own Words.

They that have read the Paper intended by Dr. Clarke for the Bishops in Convocation, will best understand the two first Letters, which made way for the Illd, in which this Scripture-Argument is contained.

*And whereas the Doctor, in his Answer to that Illd Letter, complains of scholastic Terms, and of a manner of Reasoning, as different from Reasoning in any other Science, as a sixth Sense in the Body would be different from the Five we now have ; The Reader will perceive, that the scholastic Terms (so far as my Argument is concerned) are only **Three Persons in one individual Essence**, and one of these, viz. individual Essence, is altogether a scriptural Term, being the English of Jehovah, Deut. vi. 4. and the other Words, Three Persons therein, are prov'd by the Scriptures contain'd in the Argument. And I am very willing to allow, that the Divine Revelation, by which Three Persons in one Essence is prov'd, is as different from Mathematics and Metaphysics ; and the Faith, by which alone we apprehend it, is as different from the Way of attaining Skill in those Sciences, as a sixth Sense in the Body would be different from the Five we now have.*

But when He hints, that Three Persons in one individual Essence is not in the Texts quoted by me; if the Meaning of those Terms are thereby prov'd, I hope it will be no prejudice against the Argument, that the Terms themselves are not therein expressly used.

I shall set down this in the Words of the late Archbishop Tillotson, in one of his Sermons, publish'd, as he tells his Readers in his Preface, upon the Account of some malicious Calumnies that had been rais'd against him, viz. Serm. XLVIII. of the Folio Vol. where, speaking " of " the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, or of " Three real Differences or distinct Persons in " one and the same divine Nature;" he saith, p. 589. " Though neither the Word Trinity, nor " perhaps Person, in the Sense in which it is used " by Divines, when they treat of this Mystery, " be any where to be met with in Scripture; yet " it cannot be deny'd, but that Three are there " spoken of by the Names of Father, Son, and Ho- " ly Ghost, in whose Name every Christian is " baptized, and to each of whom the highest Ti- " tles and Properties of GOD are in Scripture " attributed; and these Three are spoken of with as " much distinction from one another, as we use to " speak of Three distinct Persons. So that though " the Word Trinity be not found in Scripture, " yet these Three are there expressly and fre- " quently mentioned; and a Trinity is nothing " but Three of any thing. And so likewise " though the Word Person be not there expressly " apply'd to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet " it will be very hard to find a more conven- " ent Word, whereby to express the Distinction " of these Three. — And tho' the Word Person " is now become a Term of Art, I see no Cause " why we should decline it, so long as we mean " by it neither more nor less than what the Scri- " pture says in other Words.

Letter



Letter I.

To the Reverend Dr. Clarke.

Reverend Sir,

Dec. 3. 1714.

I Bought last Night a Collection of Papers with the Title of, *An Apology for Dr. Clarke*, for the sake of four of them, which I had not before seen. In one of which, No. V. containing your *Reply to the Extract, &c.* I could not but observe the several Things asserted again touching *ὁμοούσιος*, the *Athanasian Creed*, and the *Passages of our Liturgy cited in your Book*, Part. III. Ch. I. to all which I knew you had received an *Answer*, the *Reply* to which I no where find.

If therefore you will condescend so far, as to promise to send me a *Reply* in Writing, which I may have time to weigh and consider, I will repeat the former *Answer*; and will attempt, *εὐθεὶς*, to shew,

I. Concerning *ὁμοούσιος*. 1. That the *Nicene Council* did not mean thereby *one kind* of Substance, but *one Individual* Substance. 2. That the Notion of *one kind* of Substance, as meant in our Creeds, in the proper Construction, would necessarily infer a plurality of Gods. 3. That the Notion of *one kind* of Substance, in your Construction and Meaning, does destroy it self: For a Substance dependent, inferior, and precarious, is not of *one kind* with, but infinitely unlike and distant from a Substance independent, absolutely supreme and necessary. 4. That yet this pre-
tended

tended one] kind of Substance does introduce Gods many, (in the Apostle's Sense of these Words, with a relation to the Heathen Demi-Gods) quite contrary to the repeated Declarations of the most High God, not only that there are none *besides* Him, but also none *like* Him.

II. Concerning the *Athanasian Creed*. 1. That *your Sense* is confessedly contrary to the *English Version*, which in several Verses reads, **They are**— which *English Version* you have often subscribed to, and once (at least) declared your Assent and Consent to the Use of, and have encouraged others of your Sentiments, in your *Introduction*, to do the like. 2. That *your Sense* is contrary to, or (at least) not at all favoured by the grammatical Construction of the *Greek Words*. 3. That *your Sense* makes this *Confession of Faith* a meer Heap of Contradictions and Inconsistencies, no ways to be solved, (which in *our Sense*, according to the *current Doctrine*, is the best Explication of the Trinity that is extant in any *Humane Writings*.) I am the more assured of what I set down under this Head, because I have at large gone over this Creed, with a very learned Defender of your Scheme; who gave it up, as to these things, as indefensible.

III. Concerning the *Passages in our Liturgy cited in your Book*, Part. III. Ch. 1. That they necessarily belong to the Christian Oeconomy, in which is made known *God manifested in the Flesh*: The Son of God *voluntarily* bringing Himself into a State of *Subordination* and Subjection to the Father for our Sakes, as a *Mediator* between God and Man. And that our coming to the Father thro' the Mediator, is no ways contrary to, but necessarily consequent upon our owning Him to be of one Individual Substance with the Father and the Holy Ghost; and to be so worshipped and glorified, *without any difference or inequality*. That there

there is no difficulty in reconciling *these Passages* with *those cited in Ch. 2.* and that they, who are the most zealous Defenders of *Three Persons in one Individual Substance*, do still chuse *these Passages cited in your Ch. I.* as perfectly agreeable to *their Doctrine*, and the best suited to Christian Worship, that they could chuse, were they to compile the Liturgy; which they believe to have been compiled by Men of the same Sentiments.

These things, I say, I hope to be able to prove, if you will promise to favour me from time to time with your *Reply*; which Promise is all that is necessary at present to be sent to,

Reverend Sir,

Your very humble Servant

P. S. If we may severally go over these things, I shall not question afterwards to free the Doctrine of *one Individual Substance* from the Charge of *Sabellianism*. I do fully believe three Persons really distinguished one from another in one glorious Being which we call GOD, and who calls Himself JEHOVAH, who therefore is not such a Being, as we and other Creatures are. His Perfection is to be *One God in Persons*.

Three, * and all the Perfections of * *Hymn at the Ordination of Priests.*
God are by necessity of Nature; and were any of the glorious Person excluded from the Divine Essence, He would not be that God that He is.

If you see fit to wave any of these Particulars mentioned above, and to confine your Discourse to, or to begin with any of the rest; be pleased to name them, and I will comply with your desire.

Dr.

Dr. Clarke's Answer to the foregoing Letter.

Dec. 6. 1714.

THE three Heads, upon which you propose to debate, are only about unscriptural Words, of *humane* and of *late* Institution ; which we can have nothing more to do with, but only to reconcile them with Scripture, as well as we can ; or if we cannot, then to reject them. It can be of no Use therefore to debate, what *may* or *may not* possibly be the Signification of such Words, till a Man has first founded his Faith upon the Words of Scripture.

Now the Scripture lays for a Foundation, that there is one God, the Πατήρ πάντων ; and one Lord, who is the Son of God, or of that Πατήρ πάντων ; and that Son of God was Incarnate, and died for our Sins, and is to be the Judge of Quick and Dead.

This (I think) is granted on all Hands. Now he that will enlarge this Faith, must produce as plain Texts for such enlargements, or shew at least, that they necessarily follow from certain Texts, by such consequence as cannot be denied, and not upon such consequence as is built on any *Hypothesis*. Now since the Difference between us is only, that *you* think *more* is taught in Scripture than *I* can find there ; it is incumbent upon *you*, to produce such Texts, as prove *more* than I acknowledge, and *that* by such necessary consequence, as I cannot shew to be inconclusive : when this is done, you have convicted me. Till this is done, no other Authority is of any other weight, but only to require us to examine it by Scripture, and reconcile it with it, if we can.

I am, Sir, your Affectionate Friend,

S. Clarke
Let-

Letter II.

To the Reverend Dr. Clarke

Reverend Sir,

Dec. 7. 1714.

I Had not propos'd a Debate about what you call *unscriptural Words of humane and of late Institution*, if (1.) I had not fully believed, that though the Syllables and Letters are of *humane Institution*, yet the Sense meant thereby is of *divine Revelation*; the Words being part of those *CreeDs* which you and I have often declared, ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain Warrants of *Holy Scripture*, in the 8th of the XXXIX Articles; and if (2.) you had not thought fit to insist upon your Sense of these Words in a *Paper* intended for the *Bishops*, now published (I presume) by your allowance; though you knew that your Readers had an *Answer* ready in their Minds which you were not pleased to make any *Reply* to. But seeing you declare against any farther Debate about them, it is not fit for me, at so great a Distance from you, to say any more about them.

I agree with you in what you say, "The *Scripture* lays for a Foundation, that there is one God—
 "and that the Son of God was incarnate, and died
 "for our Sins;" but if this Son of God be only a dependent Being, derived from another Being by the *Arbitrary Will* of Him that produced Him; then how He by his *Dying* for us should purchase us, Act. xx. 28. or an Inheritance for us, Eph. i. 14. I cannot understand. For such a derived dependent Being must owe it self, and all to Him from whom He has his Being; and so would have nothing of his own wherewith to purchase us, or an Inheritance for us.

I do not pretend to *enlarge this Faith*, as you express it, but only to explain it; so that the Scriptures which speak of it may appear every way consistent with themselves. I repeat your Words again: "*The Scripture lays for a Foundation, that there is one God——*" Deut. vi. 4. *one Jehovah*, which Word signifies (not Monarchy or Dominion, but) *Essence or Being*; and that there is none *besides Him, like Him, with Him, or after Him*; and yet that there are *Three Persons*, to whom the absolute Attributes of this *Jehovah*, or *Divine Essence*, are allowed to be ascribed, which *Jehovah* therefore is *One God in Persons Three*.

But though you should still think, that the Terms in the *Athanasian* and *Nicene Creeds* are *unscriptural Words*, &c. which are mention'd under the two first Heads of my last Letter; yet the very Words, that my third Head relates to, can by no means be thought to be *unscriptural*, of *humane* and of *late Institution*: The *Passages of our Liturgy contained in your Ch. I. of Part III.* are undoubtedly *scriptural*, and so acknowledg'd on both sides. Now it was on account of these *Passages* that you drew up that great *Charge* against us, in your Introduction, p. xxv. that we must *offer violence to them, to make them consistent with our Doctrine*. This *Charge* I thought myself bound to disown; and accordingly I did myself the Honour to write to you many Months ago, to shew you how *those Passages* are altogether consistent with *our Doctrine*, and that we cannot make our Prayers without them. We address our selves to *God the Father*, partly as the Deity, absolutely considered, is called by that Name: Thus the *Samaritan Woman* must be allowed to understand *our Saviour*, Joh. iv. 23, 24. unless you think that the *Samaritans* believ'd the Trinity; and thus God is, as you well say,

Πατήρ πάντων ; as the Heathens profess'd, ὡς γὰρ
 καὶ γένος ἔσμεν, Act. xvii. 28. But chiefly we ap-
 proach Him as the God and Father of our Lord Je-
 sus Christ, (the Son of God incarnate and dying for
 us) and in and through Him our God, and our
 reconciled Father. This belongs to the *Christian*
Oeconomy, founded upon an express Revelation,
 that the Word was made Flesh ; the Son of God
 had voluntarily taken upon Him the Office of a
 Mediator, and made Himself subject and subordi-
 nate to the Father, for the carrying on this gra-
 cious Design. This is our *Doctrine*, to which
 these Passages of the Liturgy cited in your Ch. I. do
 belong. There is no need of reconciling them to
 our Doctrine, much less of using violence to do it ;
 for nothing can more exactly harmonize or agree.
 This had been plainly laid before you ; yet
 were you pleased to draw up the same Charge
 again, in your Paper intended for my Lords the
 Bishops, without making any Reply to our An-
 swer ; which was the thing complained of in my
 last.

This therefore relating only to *Scripture Terms*,
 if you think fit that I should repeat, and enlarge
 my Answer to the Charge you bring against us,
 in order to your Reply, you need only make the
 Promise mentioned in my last, to,

Reverend Sir,

Your very humble Servant,

Dr Clarke's Answer to the II^d Letter.

Decr. 10. 1714.

HAVING a great Esteem of your Integrity and Goodness, I should be very glad we could understand each other. But I see no possibility of that, unless the *Terms*, which are the Subject of the Question, be agreed upon. By the Word *GOD*, when used absolutely, I mean that *supreme intelligent Agent which governs all things*; and the Words *Intelligent Agent* are the Definition of a *Person*. Your conclusion therefore, (if meant literally) *one God IN Persons three*, is a Language of which I understand not the Terms. *One Intelligent Agent in Three intelligent Agents*, or *three intelligent Agents in one intelligent Agent*, are English Words, but have no English signification. I suppose you mean *Three intelligent Agents in one common Substance*. But then this Question for ever remains; Are not, *Three SUPREME intelligent Agents Three Gods*? and equally so, whatever be or be not supposed to be their Substance or Substances? Consider that Question seriously. The Scripture Notion of the supreme God is, ὁ Παντοκράτωρ; which Word signifies *One Supreme Intelligent Agent governing all things*; and *intelligent Agent* is (as I said before) *Person*. No other Person is in Scripture Παντοκράτωρ. And yet, if ever that Title had been given to the *Angel of the Covenant*, how could it have been proved not to have been given Him, as the *Representative* of the Father, as He in whom *Jehovah's Name or Authority* was? Till the Meaning of Words be agreed on, there is no possibility we should understand each other.

I am, Sir, your affectionate Friend,

S. C.

Letter III.

To the Reverend Dr. Clarke.

Reverend Sir,

Dec. 14. 1714.

I Am not able to understand your last, either as to the *Force* of your Arguing, or your *Design* thereby. You say, "By the Word *God*, when understood absolutely, you understand that *supreme intelligent Agent* which *governs all things*; and the Words *intelligent Agent* are the Definition of a *Person*; and therefore you think *One God in Persons Three* is the same with *one intelligent Agent in three intelligent Agents*." Now you well know, that by the Word *God*, we mean the *Divine Essence* or *Substance*. *Jehovah* signifies the *Essence of God*, (I said so in my last, you do not deny it, and so I forbear proving it) *Osds* in the New Testament, is the Translation of *Jehovah*, Joh. vi. 45. *They shall be all taught of GOD*, which is the Version of *Jehovah* in Isa. liv. 13. So Rom. iv. 3. *Abraham believed God*, as *Jehovah* in Gen. xv. 6. is translated. Can you then possibly think, that a *supreme intelligent Agent*, which *governs the World*, is a Definition of the *Essence of God*? So far is it from it, that He actually was the *same God* before ever there was a *World* made for Him to *govern*; and so might for ever have been the *same divine Essence* which He is, tho' He had never been the *supreme Agent that governs the World*. *Supreme* is a relative Term, and implies *subordinate*. And *Supremacy* ariseth from a *Right of Dominion* over the *Subordinate*; which *Right of Dominion*, with respect to *God*, results

sults from his having *created all Things by his Will and Pleasure*. And the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, having the *same Right of Dominion* over the *same Subjects*, are not three SUPREMES, but one Supreme. Which *supremacy* relating only to a *World* made by his *arbitrary Agency*, does not necessarily belong to the *Essence* of God, and so cannot so much as enter into the Definition of it. Alas! Sir, I fear the *Humane Understanding* is not capable of *Defining the Divine Essence*. God (I doubt not) can define his own *Essence*, but He has not given to us any adequate Ideas of the manner of his *Existence*: sure we are, that He doth not exist after the manner that created Beings do. When once you *define the Divine Essence*, so as to take into the Definition all that belongs to his *essential Perfections*, then will I also *define the Three* that *subsist* in that *Essence*, and give them such a *Name* as shall *univocally* agree to them; which we readily acknowledge that the *Name of Person* does not. Till then, you well know that we use the Word in an *Analogical Sense*. Amongst us Men, *Personalitas est distinctio unus ab omnibus aliis in eadem naturâ specificâ*; and he that is so distinguished, is called a *Person*. Now finding in Scripture that there is a *real Distinction* of *Three* in the singular *Essence of God*, we have no better Name to call that *distinction* by, than that of *Personality*; and the *Three* so distinguished, we call *Persons*, because of the remote *Analogy* that this *ineffable distinction*, in the *individual Essence* of God, has to the common *Distinction* in the *specific Natures* of the *Creatures*. In like manner, the *Schools* use the Word *Mode*, and the *Three Persons* are called by them *Tres modi subsistendi*: not as if the Word *Mode* signified *univocally* the same

same thing as it does when used of created Substances—— we abhor such a Thought ; but we use the Word *analogically*. *Officium & usus modi est, non componere sed distinguere: sic etiam modus subsistendi in Deo non componit sed distinguit unam divinam Personam ab aliâ.* So it is *modus eminentialis*, there being *aliquid reale positivum* that does eminently distinguish each one of the Three from the other Two, in an infinitely more perfect manner, than any Modes can distinguish in a created Being ; a permanent and unchangeable Property, whereby one Person is distinguished from the other Persons, and that really *ab aeterno in aeternum*. Thus have I explained the Terms we use, and in what Sense we use them: And when you argue against us, by putting *another Sense* upon the Terms, that you know we do not take them in, it is then your Fault ; which you continue in, on purpose that you might make *Being* and *Person* to signify the same thing ; and to hinder your self from understanding, *one God in Persons Three* ; and that the *Almighty God* ὁ Παντοκράτωρ is not *one Person*, but *Three Persons in one Substance*.

And after all, as I cannot see the force of your Arguing, so neither the *design* of it. For, Dear Sir, what is all this to the purpose of my last Letter ? I offer'd to shew, that we were not guilty of an heinous Charge, that you had brought against us, *viz.* that we made our Prayers in such Words as were contrary to our Belief of *one God in Persons Three*. This you had *charg'd* us with formerly, which I had *Answered* to. You repeated your Charge in your Paper intended for the Bishops, without *Replying* to our *Answer*. This I complained of in my last, and you neither offer to maintain the Charge, nor to recal it.

Thus

Thus have you rejected the Methods I propos'd for the finding out the Truth, which we both profess to be sincerely seeking after : But I must own, you have hinted a better Method than any of them, which I began with upon the first Reading your Book ; and shall now readily return to, upon the Encouragement given me by a Passage in yours of the 6th Instant ; where, after you had made mention of the *Foundation*, that *there is one God*, and that *the Son of God was Incarnate*, &c. you have these Words.—“ *The difference between us is this, that you [directing your Words to me] think more is taught in Scripture than I can find there. It is incumbent upon you to produce such Texts, as prove more than I acknowledge, and that by such necessary Consequence, as I cannot shew to be inconclusive : When this is done, you have convicted me.*” This is great Encouragement, and, by the Grace of God, I will attempt it. That which is *more* than you acknowledge is, that the *Son of God* is of *one Substance* or *one Essence* (taking the Words *strictly* and *properly*) with the *Father*. This you say in your *Scripture Doctrine*, p. 465. *cannot be true*. You have advanc'd a Doctrine contradictory to it. I hope to shew you plain *Texts* of Scripture to overthrow your Doctrine, and by consequence to establish *our own*. That which you have been pleas'd to take upon you is, to shew that the Argument which I shall bring from these *Texts* is *inconclusive*.

And I shall only premise one thing, and crave leave to refer to it afterwards by the Name of the *Preliminary Postulatum* : That we must Reason from the *Scripture Revelation*, which is *intelligible*, and intended for us to *search into*, and to *find out* the Meaning of ;
and

and not from the *metaphysical Essence* of God; considered in it self, which is *incomprehensible*, and which we cannot *search into*, or *find out*. You your self own, that no stress is to be laid upon *Reasoning deduced from the supposed Essence of God*, §. IV. p. 243. Indeed we know little of the *Essences* or *Natures* of even created Beings. There is a poor Stone, [the Magnet] that were we to make our Reasonings directly from the Nature of it, and knew no more, we should think it absolutely impossible, that it should have the Properties, that now we otherways know that it hath. We know yet less of the *Natures* of created *Spirits*. But how vastly more is the infinite *Nature* and *Essence* of *GOD*, inscrutable by natural Light or Reason? So that we can never argue what *may be*, or *may not be*, in such an incomprehensible *Nature*, any otherwise than by the *Scripture-Revelation*. Let this be, as I said, our *Preliminary Postulatum*.

And now I proceed to set down your *Doctrine*, which I am to argue against, as I find it in your Book, call'd, *The Scripture Doctrine*.—viz. That there is another Divine Being *besides* the supreme independent Being, and distinct from Him, yet *with* Him, *like* Him, and *after* Him, both with respect to Nature and Worship.

You describe the *Son of God*,

1. As a *Divine Being*, to whom belongs *Obéissance*, p. 442. and the *highest Titles* are ascribed; even such as include *all Divine Powers*, except absolute Supremacy and Independency, p. 298. yet another *distinct Being besides* the independent Being, p. 298, 270. The Father alone being the one *Eternal God*, p. 455, 429.

2. Though He be of a *distinct Essence* from this one *Eternal God*, yet was He *with* Him

in all his glorious Operations, p. 367. He doing all by *Him*, p. 455.

3. And therefore He is so like this independent Being, in the *highest Titles and Attributes*, as to be compared with Him in all things, except absolute Supremacy and Independency, p. 298.

4. And yet He is after Him.

1. With respect to *Nature and Essence*, which He derives from the independent Being, viz. the one eternal God, as the *supreme Cause*, p. 270. and which is therefore subordinate to, and depending upon that supreme Being, p. 298.

2. With respect to *Worship*, which is, 1. of another Kind and Manner, and upon another Account than that which is paid to the Eternal God, p. 415. viz. upon the Account of *Actions and Attributes relative to us*, p. 372. And which also, 2. was not given Him from the Beginning, nor till after the Accomplishment of His Humiliation, p. 368.

Now my *Scripture-Argument* against this Doctrine is: That the One Eternal Almighty GOD ὁ Πατήρ declares, and the Writers inspired by Him declare, that there is no other distinct Being, besides, with, like, or after Him, to whom such divine Powers, Attributes or Titles belong; or to whom such divine Worship is at any time to be given. And by consequence, that the Son of God, to whom Θεός and divine Attributes and Worship do belong, is not a distinct Being from the one Eternal God; but a distinct Person from the Father and the Holy Ghost in one and the same Eternal Essence. The one Eternal God being not one Person, but Three Persons in one Substance or Essence.

I shall produce my *Proofs* under *three Heads*, and set down the *Answers* you have already return'd, and the *Replies* that I have formerly made, that you may shew (which I humbly conceive is not yet done) that my Argument is *inconclusive*.

I. The *Texts* that declare that there is no other distinct Divine Being besides the supreme eternal God, with Him, like Him, or after Him.

That there is none besides Him :

Isa. XLIV. 6. — *And besides me there is no God.*

v. 8. — *Is there any God besides me? yea, there is no God; I know not any.*

Isa. XLV. 5. *I am the Lord, and there is none else; there is no God besides me.* v. 18. *I am the Lord, and there is none else.* v. 22. *I am God, and there is none else.*

That there is none like Him. The Son is indeed the express Image of His Father's Person in the same Essence, and so equal with the Father : but with respect to any other distinct Being, it is said thus :

Isa. XL. 25. *To whom then will you liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One.*

Isa. XLVI. 5. *To whom will you liken me, and make me equal, and compare me, that we may be like? v. 9. I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me.*

That there is none with Him. The Person of the Son is indeed with the Person of the Father, in all his glorious Operations, Prov. viii. 30. because in Him, Joh. xiv. 10. or with Him in the same Divine Essence, Joh. i. 1. But with respect to any other Being, He saith :

Deut. XXXII. 39. *I, even I am He, and there is no God with me.*

That there is none after Him:

Isa. XLIII. 10. *Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be any after me.*

I shall set down your former Answer in your own Words. "The Texts are plainly spoken of the *one God*; you infer, that the Son is therefore that *same God*. I answer: If that be properly true, it will follow, that the Son is the Father; otherwise He will not be (properly and strictly speaking) that God which is the Father. For the only Signification of the *one God*, when used absolutely, is *He* [or that Person] which is supreme over all. The Son is not another God, (which He must needs be, if He were co-ordinate and equal, either in a *like*, or in the *same* Nature or Essence, for two supreme Persons are two Gods,) but He is a Person who is God by communication of *Θεότης* Divine Power and Authority, and ineffable Attributes from the Father."

To this I sent you formerly this Reply.

Dr. Cl— begins thus: "*The Texts are plainly spoken of the one God, you infer that the Son is therefore that same God.*" I Reply. 1. This doth not seem to be the Inference immediately intended from these Texts, but rather *this*: That seeing it is granted on both sides, that the Texts are spoken of the *one God*, that there is none *besides* Him, with Him, *like* Him, &c. therefore there are no other derived and dependent Beings, to whom the Divine Power and other ineffable Attributes do belong; and by consequence it is indeed inferr'd, that the Son and Holy Ghost are the same *Jehovah*, or *one divine Being* with the Father; or else they are by these Texts excluded from all communication of *Θεότης*, or di-

vine

vine Attributes. 2. If the immediate Inference from these Texts were, that *the Son is therefore the same God*, the Texts in several Instances would fully come up to the Proof of it. When we find that the *one God* saith, *Isa. xlv. 6. I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God.* And when we see it is *the Son* that saith, *I am the first, and I am the last*, *Rev. i. 8, 11, 17.* we conclude, that the *Son* is the *same God*, besides whom there is no God. So in *Isa. xlv. 22, 23.* The *one God* saith, *I am God, and there is none else; I have sworn by my self, that unto me every Knee shall bow.* Now that it is *the Son* that so swears by Himself, is plain from *Rom. xiv. 10, 11.* We must all stand before the Judgment Seat of CHRIST, for it is written, *As I live saith the Lord, every Knee shall bow to me.* For if God the Father had said, in exclusion of the Son, that *He was God, and there is none else*, and that every Knee should bow to Him; it had been so far from being a Proof, that we should stand and bow before the Judgment Seat of CHRIST, that it would have proved the contrary: But if it be the Lord CHRIST that saith, *Every Knee shall bow to me*; then is He the same God that saith, *I am God, and there is none else.*

When therefore Dr. Cl—— argues against this, after this manner: “*The Son must needs be another God if He be equal with the Father in the same Nature, or Essence, for two supreme Persons are two Gods.*” This way of Arguing is contrary to our Preliminary Postulat-um, for it is arguing not from Scripture Revelation, but from the divine Nature or Essence, considered in it self, which is incomprehensible, unsearchable, past finding out by our Reason. How knows he what must needs be, or what cannot

cannot be, in an Essence which he cannot understand? There may be in the Divine Essence, *Alius & Alius*, and yet not *Aliud & Aliud*, for ought he or any Man knows: for humane Reason cannot comprehend this infinite Essence; and therefore it admits not of any arguing about it from meer natural Light, Reason, or Philosophy.

This was my former Reply; from which it appears, that you have not yet shewed my Argument from these Texts to be *inconclusive*; for you have not meddled with the *medium* that I used, which was, that these Texts exclude all *other Beings*, besides the supreme independent Being, from any *communication* of *Essence*; and by consequence, that the Son (to whom, beyond all doubt, *Essence* is communicated, Col. ii. 9.) is of the *same Essence* with the Father, and not *another Being*: It being the Perfection of the *one God*, that He is *not one Person*, but *three Persons in one Substance or Essence*.

II. Texts that prove that the *highest Titles* and *Divine Attributes* are so appropriated to the *one Eternal God*, as to exclude all *other Beings* from any communication therein.

Some of these mention his *absolute Titles* and *Attributes*.

2 Kings XIX. 19. *Thou art the Lord God, even Thou only.*

Neh. IX. 6. *Thou, even Thou, art Lord alone.*

Psal. LXXXIII. 18. *Thou, whose Name alone is Jehovah.*

— LXXXVI. 10. *Thou art Great, &c. Thou art God alone.*

Zech. XIV. 9. *In that Day shall there be one Lord, and his Name one.*

Isa. XLI. 4. *I am the Lord, the first, and with the last, I am He.*

Isa.

Isa. XLIV. 6. *I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God. So*
Chap. xlviii. 12.

1 Kings VIII. 39. *Thou, even Thou only knowest the Hearts of the Children of Men.*

Some mention Titles and Attributes relative
to us.

Joel II. 27. *I am the Lord thy God, and none else.*

Isa. XLIV. 24. *I am the Lord that maketh all Things, that stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, and spreadeth abroad the Earth by my self.*

Job IX. 8. *Which alone spreadeth out the Heavens, and treadeth upon the Waves of the Sea.*

Isa. XLV. 6, 7. *I am the Lord, and there is none else; I form the Light, and create Darkness. I make Peace, and create Evil. I the Lord do all these things.*

Deut. III. 24. *For what God is there in Heaven, or in Earth, that can do according to thy Works, and according to thy Might?*

Hosea XIII. 4. *I am the Lord thy God from the Land of Egypt, and thou shalt have no God but me; for there is no Saviour beside me.*

Isa. XLIII. 11. *I, even I am the Lord, and beside me there is no Saviour.*

— XLV. 21. *There is no God else beside me, a just God, and a Saviour, there is none beside me. Ver. 22. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the Ends of the Earth, for I am God, and there is none else.*

Deut. XXXII. 39. *I am He, and there is no God with me. I kill, and I make alive, &c.*

Your

Your former *Answer* to these *Texts* was in the Words following: "The *Texts* contain many Attributes of the Father, which are all so indeed ascribed to the Son, but never in the same supreme Sense, and, I think, hardly ever without a manifest and express Distinction in the Text it self. If they were so ascribed to the Son, as to the Father, it would of necessity infer, either an equality of the Subjects that are spoken of, which is two Gods; or else that they are spoken of one and the same individual Subject; whence it would follow, that (the Father being that whole Subject) the Son were nothing else but the Father Himself."

My former Reply to this *Answer* was as follows:

Dr. Cl.—in his Answers to these Texts saith: That "when many Attributes of the Father are ascribed to the Son, it is never done in the supreme Sense, hardly (as he thinks) without a manifest and express distinction in the Text it self." To which I Reply. 1. That this Answer does not directly come up to the Design of quoting these Texts, which was this, that seeing the one God did appropriate such Titles and Attributes to Himself, therefore they were not communicated to any other Being. e. g. The one God saith, that His Name alone is *Jehovah*: That He only knows the Hearts of the Children of Men; so that either the Son and Spirit are the same one God, or else they are excluded from the Title of *Jehovah*, by *Psal.* LXXXIII. 18. and from the Attribute of Omniscience, by 1 *Kings* VIII. 39. and so of the rest. 2. That in many Texts where these Titles and Attributes are given to the Son, there is no Distinction, much less any manifest and express Distinction, by which they

they should appear not to be given to Him in the most supreme Sense. This is evident by comparing *Isa. xlv. 6.* with *Rev. i. 8, 11, 17.* mention'd before; and by comparing *1 Kings viii. 39.* of *His only knowing Hearts*, with *Rev. ii. 23.* where the Son saith— and all the Churches shall know that I am He which searcheth the Reins and the Hearts; and in many other Instances. Dr. Cl—— further saith, That “ if the Titles and “ Attributes were spoken of one and the same Individual Subject, it would follow, (the Father “ being that whole Subject) the Son were nothing “ else but the Father Himself.” To which I Reply: *Ut Persona distinguitur ab essentiâ, sic proprietates Personales distinguuntur ab essentialibus.* The personal Property of the Father, [quatenus Father,] is to beget the Son; and if this were ascribed to the Son, it would follow, that the Son is the Father; but the Titles and Attributes mentioned in these Texts are essential, belonging to the Deity or Divine Essence, [and so say we, To Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,] and to say, that if the Father and the Son have the same individual Essence, then the Son is the Father, is a Way of arguing contrary to our Preliminary Postulatum, viz. a Reasoning about an incomprehensible Nature, which our Understandings cannot reach. *Credimus unam eandemq; personarum licet plurimum, infinitam substantiam seu essentiam. Pater totam essentiam divinam possidet, totam tamen & Filius, totam & Spiritus S.* Whether this be so or no, we must argue from Scripture, (which is design'd for our Understanding) and not from the Divine Essence, considered in it self, which no Humane Understanding can search into.

This I Reply'd formerly; and I must observe to you, that you have not yet shew'd my
 E Ar-

Argument from these Texts to be *inconclusive*, that the independent Being, by appropriating these Titles and these Perfections to Himself, has utterly excluded all derived and dependent Beings from assuming these Titles, and having these Perfections. And then it will follow, that either these Titles and Perfections must not be ascribed to *the Son* in any strict or proper Sense, or else that *the Son* is, as we believe, of one and the same *Essence* with the Father and the Holy Ghost: And the *one God* therefore, is not *one Person*, but *Three Persons in one Substance or Essence*.

III. Texts that prove that *Adoration* and *Divine Worship* is so appropriated to the one independent Being, that it cannot be communicated to any other Being whatsoever.

Exod. XX. 3. Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.

Deut. VI. 4. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.

Mark XII. 29,— 34. And Jesus answered, The first of all the Commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God, &c. And the Scribe answered, Well Master, thou hast said the Truth: for there is one God, and there is none other but He, &c. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, &c.

Isa. XLII. 8. I am the Lord, that is my Name, and my Glory will I not give to another. —

— XLV. 22, 23. I am God, and there is none else; I have sworn by my self, the Word is gone out of my Mouth in Righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every Knee shall Bow, and every Tongue shall Swear.

Matt.

Matt. IV. 10. *It is written, [viz. in Deut. VI. 3. according to the LXX,] Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.*

By which Words, He does not tell the Tempter, that He was an improper Object of Worship, as being an impure Spirit; but that there was no other Being that was the Object of that Worship which he claimed, but the *one God alone*. Which is yet more remarkable, because the Devil claimed not this Worship, as originally due to him, but as derived or communicated to him, as appears by the Tempter's Words, *Luk. iv. 6, 7. All this Power will I give Thee, and the Glory of them, for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will, I give it; if thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine.* Now by the before cited Answer to this Temptation, our Lord shews that no other Beings are to be worshipped, but the most high God; all dependent Beings are excluded from that Honour; and if the Son be not with the Father and the Holy Ghost, that *one independent Being*, the Worship paid to Him by the Christian Church is Idolatry, and doing Service to one that by Nature is no God.

To these Texts you answered as follows: "I answer: That the Adoration or Worship of the Father is indeed incommunicable, and can no more be given to the Son, than, on the contrary, the Worship of the Mediator or Intercessor, can (without the greatest Absurdity) be given to the Father. Glory to Him that sitteth upon the Throne, supreme over all, who created all Things (according to his own Will) by his Son. This Worship cannot be paid to the Son. On the other side, Glory to the Lamb who redeemed us with his Blood. This Worship cannot be paid to

" the Father. Both sorts of Worship are
 " Religious, both may (*satis sensu*) be called
 " Divine, but still they are really as distinct
 " from each other, as the *civil* Worship paid
 " to a King on the Throne, is different from
 " the *civil* Worship paid to his only Son and
 " Heir, whom He intrusts with the Govern-
 " ment.

" The Texts in our Saviour's Answer to
 " the Devil, do not suppose *inferior* Worship to
 " inroach on the *supreme* Worship of God: For
 " how can *inferior* Worship be any Part of
 " what is due to the Supreme? But the De-
 " vil claimed *inferior* Worship (though I think,
 " absolutely, and not pretending it to be to
 " the Honour of God.) And our Saviour
 " deny'd any such to be due to Him; because
 " God had not commanded any one to be
 " worshipped, with such an inferior or me-
 " diatorial worship, but had [hitherto] com-
 " manded that himself only should be wor-
 " shipped; yet it doth not from hence at all
 " follow, that when God had really given all
 " Power in Heaven and Earth to a Mediator,
 " it should then be unlawful to Worship Him,
 " who was so exalted, and whose Worship
 " does not at all interfere with the Worship
 " of the supreme God. The Idolatry of the
 " Church of Rome is not (as many weakly
 " imagine) Idolatry against God, (for pray-
 " ing to Saints to intercede for us, is not the
 " Worship of God;) but 'tis Idolatry against
 " Christ. 'Tis setting up not an *Idol* God,
 " but an *Idol-Mediator*. So St. Paul calls
 " Angel Worship, a *not* holding the Head,
 " which is Christ."

My former Reply to your Answer was in
 these Words: Dr. C. saith, " The Adorati-
 " on or Worship of the Father is indeed incom-
 " municable,

"municable, and can no more be given to the
 "Son, than the Worship of the Mediator can be
 "given to the Father. To which I Reply. 1.
 That we do indeed worship the Son as Medi-
 ator, and come to God the Father in his Name,
 through his Mediation; but even this Wor-
 ship is given to Him, upon the Account of his being
 God as well as Man; and particularly upon the Ac-
 count of his *supreme Omniscience*, which belongs to
 Him as the *one God* with the Father and the Holy
 Ghost. And therefore we reject the Popish
 Prayers to the *Virgin Mary*, and to other
 Saints, not only as Idolatry against the Me-
 diator, but as Idolatry against the *one God*,
 as an usurping upon his *Omniscience* and ubi-
 quity, or knowledge of Mens Hearts in all
 Places. 2. The Son is also worshipped, and
 immediately invoked in unity with the Fa-
 ther, when there is no express mention of
 his Mediation, as 1 *Theff.* iii. 11, 12. and 2
Theff. ii. 16, 17. And this Adoration is done
 by *Angels*, who have no need of his Media-
 tion: And though they worship Him, who is
 the Lamb of God to us, yet not as a Sacri-
 fice for them, but as the One Adorable Be-
 ing, to whom all Worship is appropriated,
 and because all must honour the Son, as they
 honour the Father, *Rev.* v. 11, 12. And
 therefore the Worship which He challengeth
 is upon this Account, because *He is God*, and
there is none else; in the *aforecited Isa.* xlv.
 22, 23. which will be especially understood,
 when every Knee shall bow to Him, in Heaven,
 and Earth, and under the Earth, viz. at the
 Day of Judgment, to which that Text is ap-
 ply'd, *Rom.* xiv. 10, 11.

And whereas Dr. Cl— seems to think, that
 the *one God*, who required Himself to be on-
 ly worshipped, *Matt.* iv. 10. was the Father
 only,

only, who had [hitherto] commanded that Himself only should be worshipped, viz. till after the Resurrection of Christ, when all Power was to be given into His Hands. The contrary appears, not only from the Commands, *Psal. ii. 11, 12.* and *xlv. 6.* (which made up part of the constant Church Liturgy before our Lord's Incarnation) but from the Command given to the Angels, *Heb. i. 6.* When He brought his first begotten into the World, He said, Let all the Angels of God worship Him; which Worship they paid Him upon his first coming into the World, *Luk. ii. 13, 14.* By all which it appears, that the Son with the Father and the Holy Ghost, is the one God, and there is none else that hath sworn, To me every Knee shall bow. Is there a God besides me? I know not any. As [hitherto] He knew of none to be worshipped besides Himself, so He knew of none to come. Before me there was no God formed, neither after me shall be any: but, as it was in the Beginning, is now, and ever shall be, World without end. Amen.

I have much more to say in Confirmation of this plain Scripture-Argument against your Doctrine of the Trinity; but I forbear, till I see whether you will shew me, that it is inconclusive.

I am,

Reverend Sir,

Your very Humble Servant,

Dr.

Dr. Clarke's Answer to the III^d Letter.

Dec. 15. 1714.

I Receiv'd your Letter, in which I see much Goodness and Honesty, but the Reasoning I comprehend not at all. I see no help, but we must of necessity part like Men who understand not each other's Language. The Scholastic Terms and Maxims you go upon are altogether above my Capacity; and their manner of Reasoning seems to me as different from Reasoning in any other Science, as a sixth Sense in the Body would be different from the Five we now have.

I have no other Notion of God, but his being *supreme Governour of the Universe*, and that He derived this Power from none, but had it eternally of Himself, being Self-existent. This is the Notion of God by the Light of Nature. This God, the Old Testament styles the Creator of Heaven and Earth, the God of *Abraham*, of *Israel*, &c. And the New Testament styles the same God, *The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Your Texts prove abundantly that this God is but one; and that there can be no other God, no other *παντοκράτωρ* besides Him. But then the Gospel teaches, that as there is one God, so there is also one Mediator. And if you think the Texts of the Old Testament prove that mediatorial Worship cannot be paid to the Mediator, this Argument is not against me, but against *Christianity it self*. If you say, the Mediator is therefore worshipped, because He is one with God, whom He mediates to: I answer, the New Testament gives not this Reason for his Worship, but quite another Reason: Neither can any Man's saying that *Δεο* are

are ^{we} make them to be so: nor indeed have the Words of that Assertion any Signification at all, to my Apprehension. And how any Man can believe or disbelieve He knows not what, (or why He should *aim* at so doing, with regard to Words of mere humane and late Invention) I apprehend not.

You mention finding in *Scripture*, *individual Essence*; and the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost having the *same Right of Dominion*, &c. but these Things are not in any of your *Texts*, but in the *School Maxims* only. The Words, *I and my Father are ^{we} one*, you will find considered in my Answer to Mr. Nelson.

I am, Sir,

Your Affectionate Friend,

————— S. C.

P. S. What you have hinted in some of your Letters concerning the Articles and Creeds, does not belong to the Science of *Divinity*, but of *Law*. Do you really think that the first Christians had any thoughts of changing their *natural* Notion of God into a *Scholastic* one, upon the Apostles preaching to them, the Judge of Quick and Dead?

THUS have I set down my plain *Scripture-Argument against Dr. Clarke's Doctrine of the Trinity*; and I hope it will appear to stand in its full force, without my making any Reply to his last Letter. Seeing the *Doctor* thinks it fit that we should *part, like Men that understand not each other's Language*, I think it necessary

fary to appeal to the Christian Reader, on which side this confusion of Language lies; whether on *his*, who saith, *he has no Notion of God, but his being supreme Governour of the Universe*; as if the World were co-eternal with Him: or on *our side*, who believe an infinitely-glorious Being or *Essence*, which we call *God*, (abstractedly from our consideration of Him, as *supreme Governour of the Universe*) existing from everlasting, before the Mountains were brought forth, or ever He had formed the Earth and the World; before any other Beings did exist for Him to be the supreme Governour of.

But though Dr. Clarke is pleas'd to rest the Matter here; yet I will not conceal it from the Reader, that I have met with three *Objections* against this *Argument*, which I shall return *Answers* to, that it may appear more plain and easie to be understood.

I. It has been said, that the *Texts* which I have cited, are design'd to exclude the *Heathen Gods, Idols and Images*; and that the universal Words therein, are to be limited by that design: So that when He saith, *there is no God besides Him, and there is none else*, it means only, that the *Gods of the Heathen are no Gods, but Works of Mens Hands*.

To which I answer, that no doubt, the immediate design of many of those *Texts*, particularly in the Prophecy of *Isaiah*, is to exclude the *Heathen Gods, Idols, and Images*; the Context plainly shews it, in what goes before and after: But this I take to be so far from being a Prejudice against the *Argument*, that it is a strong Confirmation thereof. For the *Texts* cited are the *Divine Reasoning* that God is pleas'd to use against the Heathen Gods. They had *Gods many, and Lords many*; but, saith the Almighty, none of these are to be Worshipped; because,

because, *I am God, and there is none besides me: I am God, and there is none else.* This way of Reasoning is express'd in some of the Texts, and imply'd in the rest. 1 Sam. ii. 2. *There is none Holy as the Lord, for there is none beside Him.* Hos. xiii. 4. *I am the Lord thy God from the Land of Egypt, thou shalt have no other God but me, for there is no Saviour beside me.* So that were there other divine Beings to be Worshipped and Glorify'd, with, or beside the most High God, this Reasoning against the Heathen Gods would lose its force. But the Manner, and so the Strength of this Reasoning, will appear; in that the Heathen Gods were indeed Devils, usurping Spirits, or spiritual Wickednesses in high Places, that sought to rival the only true God. Their Chief is alluded to, for saying in his Heart, — *I will be like the most High,* Isa. xiv. 12,—14. The Prophetical Song of Moses, Dent. xxxii. 17. tells us, *They Sacrificed to Devils, not to God: to Gods whom they knew not, &c.* So saith the Psalmist, Psal. cvi. 37. These usurping Spirits resided in the Idols or Images; thence they gave their Answers, and receiv'd their Worship: From this Residence in the Images, and by reason of the Oracles given forth, and the Protection that the People expected from them, they lavish'd Gold out of the Bag to beautifie these Idols, they carried them on their Shoulders in solemn Processions, or set them up in their Places, as the several Parts of the Worship required. Their Priests, call'd Diviners and Soothsayers, continually oppos'd the Ministers of the true God; as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, vying with him, whose Miracles were the greatest, those of Jehovah, or those of their Gods; as the Priests of Baal undertook to contend with Elijah, whose God should bring down Fire from Heaven upon the Sacrifices. These were

were the Rivals of the most High, that these Texts were design'd against, who pretended to be *like the most High*, and claim'd a Worship *besides*, or *with Him*. And how doth the Divine Wisdom argue against them? He does not distinguish of derived Beings, which *might* be Worshipped by the Children of Men, and which *might not*. If there had been such a distinction, the Universality of the Expressions [there is none *besides me*, *with me*, *like me*, &c.] might be limited to one sort or kind of Beings there express'd to be excluded; but the most High gives not the least intimation (with respect to Worship) of any difference between Gods of his Forming, and Gods of their own making; between *Israelitish* God, and *Heathen* Gods; between false Gods, and true Gods; there is not the least mention of any *true Gods* besides *Jehovah*, who constantly declares that *there is none else*. And though we find in other Parts of holy Writ, that the invisible Principalities and Powers are of different Sorts; some Holy and Pure, others Wicked and Unclean; some Above, and some Beneath; yet as to the Matter of their being Divine Beings, and fit Objects of Worship, they are all equally excluded by this *way of Reasoning*; those in Heaven, as well as others, *Psal. lxxxix. 6. For who in the Heaven can be compared unto the Lord? Who among the Sons of the Mighty can be likened unto the Lord?* This is further plain, from the same *Reasoning* that our *Saviour* used in the same Case. The Devil claim'd this Worship, upon the Account of an Authority derived or *deliver'd* to him, and which he had long exercis'd in the World; and he made his Promises large to obtain the Worship he claimed: How now did our Lord answer him? He did not barely deny his claim, by telling him that he was an Usurper, and that no such Au-

thority was rightly derived to Him, or *delivered* into his Hands ; but by telling Him, that the most High God alone was to be Worshipped, and that no inferior or merely derived Being could put in any such claim ; so that *Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve*, is just the same as *Jehovah's Words, I am God, and there is none besides me : I am God, and there is none else.*

And this way of Reasoning that God is pleased to use, is the more strong, because He does not say, He had not *made known* any other Beings that were fit to be worshipped ; but that He himself did *know* of none such, *Isa. xliv. 8. Is there a God beside me ? yea, there is no God, I know not any.* Yea further, He does not say, that *as yet* [or *hitherto*] there were no such Beings as had Titles and Attributes, Power or Dominion fit to make them Objects of Worship ; but that there should be none hereafter, *Isa. xliii. 10. Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be any after me.* It is upon this very account therefore that these Texts are so strong a Reasoning against the Heathen Gods that resided in their Idols and Images, because they so plainly assert *one only Divine Being*, and that *no other* is to be own'd or Worshipped but He.

Besides all this, there are many of the Declarations that do not directly respect the excluding the Heathen Idols, but are intended only to enforce the Worship of the true God ; which is much helped forward by this Consideration, that there are no *other Beings* that we can address our selves to, but that *one who is God, and none else.* It is for this purpose that He saith, that *His Name alone is Jehovah ; that He only knows the Hearts of the Children of Men.* So the Preface to the Commandments, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord :* And the first Commandment,

mandment, *Thou shalt have none other Gods but me*, have this Design, to enforce that which is the Sum of all, *viz. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart; &c.* And when He gives *this Reason* for his Worship, why every Knee should bow to Him, *Isa. xlv. 22.* it is either spoken of the *Gentiles* being brought to Faith in our Saviour; *Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the Ends of the Earth, for I am God, and none else*; or it is spoken of the *Judgment-Day*, when there will be no Heathen Gods, Idols, or Images to stand in Competition with Him, that then *every Knee shall bow to Him. ver. 23.* and all this, *because He is God, and none else.*

II. It has been further objected, That these Texts mean, that there is *no other supreme God*, or that there are no other *Beings co-ordinate* with Him; and so that they do not exclude the Son, who is suppos'd by them to be indeed a distinct Divine Being, but *subordinate* to the Father, as deriving his Being and Attributes from the supreme God.

To this I say, that this is indeed the Doctrine of the *great Man* that we have been arguing against; and it has been already pleaded from these Texts, that there are no such Divine Beings derived and dependent, to whom those Titles, Attributes, and Powers belong, which are on both sides acknowledged to belong to the Son of God. So that if the *supreme God* did *alone* make all things by *Himself*, does *only* know the Hearts of Men, be the *only* Saviour, &c. then whatever Texts exclude other Beings from that *Supremacy*, must exclude them from the Titles, Attributes, and Powers which the *supreme* God appropriates to *Himself*. It is true, there has been a common Distinction between the *communicable* and *incommunicable* Attributes of God: The Meaning of which, is only this:
Those

Those are called *incommunicable*, of which there are not the least Footsteps or Resemblance in the Creatures; as *Eternity, Immensity, Unchangeableness, Allsufficiency, Omniscience, Independency, &c.* And these are called *communicable*, of which there is some analogy or resemblance in the Creatures; as *Holiness, Wisdom, Justice, Goodness, Truth, &c.* But still this is but Analogy and Resemblance, and when these Attributes are called *communicable*, they are not properly, but *analogically* so. *Holiness, Justice, Goodness, &c.* are only Qualities, or Accidents in the Creatures, separable from their Natures, or adventitious thereunto. As the *New Creature* is called the *Divine Nature*, 2 Pet. ii. 4. So the particular Graces are called by the Names of the *Divine Attributes*, as being the *Image of God* * new form'd in the Soul. But as the *Divine Nature*, strictly and properly understood, is not *communicable* to the Creatures, so neither are the *Divine Attributes*. *Justice, Holiness, Goodness*, and other Attributes of God, are really His *Essence*, and not distinct from it, but only in our Conception; *I am Understanding*, saith God, Prov. viii. 14. and *God is Love*, 1 Joh. iv. 8. *Cave sis ne Perfectiones Dei cogites esse Accidentia, aut dispositiones quasdam ab essentia verè distinctas, eandem accessu sui modificantes: uti id obtinet in creaturis, quæ recipiendo adjuncta quadam in sese, eo ipso majorem quasi Perfectionis gradum consequuntur, dum acquirunt quod in seipsis non possidebant.* God is

* The Image of God is, 1. Proper and express. So the Son is the Image of the Father in the same Essence, Heb. i. 3. but no distinct or other Being can be like the Divine Being, Deut. xxxiii. 26. unless by gross Usurpation, Isa. xiv. 14. 2. Improper, and with infinite disparity This Man had by the Creation, Gen. i. 26, 27, has by Grace, Col. iii. 10. and in Glory, Psal. xvii. 15.

only *Wise, only Good, only Holy, &c.* not only because All *Wisdom, Goodness, Holiness, &c.* in the Universe is from Him ; but because *there is none Good, Wise, Holy, &c. but one, that is GOD,* in the same *univocal* Sense that those Attributes belong to God, *Matt. xix. 17.* All *Goodness, Wisdom, Holiness, &c.* in inferior Beings, being Qualities that bear only a faint Resemblance to the Attributes of God ; and the same Names are used for the one and for the other, only in Condescension to our Capacities, by reason of the Penury of our Languages, and for the bare Analogy sake ; it may be said of *all*, as it is of *one*, and for the same Reason: *There is none holy as the Lord, for there is none besides Him, 1 Sam. ii. 2.* To suppose the absolute Supremacy and Independency of God, to be properly communicated to any other Beings, is (as Dr. Clarke observes, *Scripture Doctrine*, p. 298.) an express Contradiction in Terms. The like may be said of all His other Attributes, strictly and properly understood, which are essential to his Being, or which are indeed his very *Essence*, that they are as *incommunicable* to other Beings, as even Supremacy and Independency. We indeed believe all the essential Attributes of God to be communicated from the Father, to the Son, and from the Father and Son to the Holy Ghost, because the *Essence* of these three Persons is *one and the same* : But if the Son be excluded from being of the same divine *Essence* with the Father, then is He excluded from all the *Divine Attributes and Perfections*, and from the *Honour, Worship, and Homage* due thereunto, as well as from Supremacy and Independency.

But I argue further, that if this be all that is meant by these Texts, to exclude other Beings, (not from Divine Titles, Attributes and Worship, but) only from being co-ordinate with the
Supreme,

Supreme, then they do not so much as exclude the *Heathen Gods*. It was observ'd before, that the Devil, in seeking to be Worshipp'd, did not pretend to absolute Supremacy, but own'd that he had *received* his Power and Authority; yet the Command to *Worship God alone*, was a sufficient Confutation of all such pretended Claims. The Heathens, (at least the Wiser sort of them) that had *Gods many, and Lords many*, did own them to be in *Subordination to one supreme God*, who was the *Πατήρ πάντων*, or as they call'd Him, *Πατήρ Ἀνδρῶν τε Θεῶν τε*; when therefore Dr. Cl—— declares, that the Honour given to Christ, is not so much upon the Account of *Essence, and abstract Attributes, but of Actions and Attributes relative to us*; in his *Scripture Doctrine*, p. 372. and that there are degrees of Worship to the several Persons upon the Account of their *respective Characters, Powers and Offices*, p. 415. that the Worship paid to the Son is an *inferior Worship* given Him in these last Days, since his Exaltation, p. 368. I cannot but fear that this is the Reviving the *Doctrine of Demons*, [*Νιδαιμολίας Δαιμονίων*, 1 Tim. iv. 1.] and that we may go on to the Worship of *Angels, Archangels, Thrones, Principalities, &c.* according to their *respective Characters, Powers, and Offices*. To this it has been answer'd on behalf of Dr. Cl—— that these *Angels and Archangels, &c.* are *Creatures*, *ἐξ ἡν ὄντων*. And I must needs say, that if the Son and *Holy Ghost* be not in the highest Sense *one God* with the Father; if the Generation of the one, and the Procession of the other, be not of *necessity of Nature*, but that they receiv'd their Being by the *arbitrary Will* of the supreme God, then are they to all intents and purposes His *Creatures*, dependent on his Will, and so at an infinite distance from Him; and if they should be suppos'd to receive their precarious

rious Beings *some other Way* than the Angels and other Creatures did, yet if the Worship given to them be not upon the *account of Essence or absolute Attributes*, much less will it be upon account of the *different Manner* of their receiving this Essence and Attributes; but as the Son of God receives a higher Worship upon the *Account* of his higher *Actions and Attributes relative to us*, so may Archangels and Angels receive a lower Worship upon the *Account* of their inferior *Actions and Attributes relative to us*. I know that Dr. Cl — and his Followers, make a difference between *ζῳονμα* and *πῳονμα*, and will own that there is no similitude between the Son of God, and the Angels, or other Creatures: But if you take away the true Difference, *viz.* that Creation is an *arbitrary Act*, by which Creatures depend on the Pleasure of God for their Being: and Generation is necessary to the Divine Essence, as much as Understanding and Intellect can be; I say, if you take away this difference, the Son of God is brought down to be a proper *πῳονμα*, or *creature* which we render *Creature*, though they may believe, that there is no similitude between Him and other Creatures. There is no similitude, that I know of, between an Archangel and a Pebblestone but in this, that they both are *dependent Beings*, at the Will of their Creator: and suppose another Being, as much above an Archangel in his Resemblance to the supreme God, in Understanding, Power, &c. as an Archangel is above a Pebblestone; yet still being *dependent Beings*, they are all *πῳονματα*, at an infinite Distance from their Maker, as dependency is from independency; and must not share in the Worship of the *most High*, nor be joined with Him in the same Prayers and Praises. The supreme God saith, *Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.* This stands in our way:

Supreme, then they do not so much as exclude the *Heathen Gods*. It was observ'd before, that the Devil, in seeking to be Worshipp'd, did not pretend to absolute Supremacy, but own'd that he had *received* his Power and Authority; yet the Command to *Worship God alone*, was a sufficient Confutation of all such pretended Claims. The Heathens, (at least the Wiser sort of them) that had *Gods many, and Lords many*, did own them to be in *Subordination to one supreme God*, who was the *Πατήρ πάντων*, or as they call'd Him, *Πατήρ Ανδρών τε Θεών τε*; when therefore Dr. Cl—— declares, that the Honour given to Christ, is not so much upon the Account of *Essence, and abstract Attributes, but of Actions and Attributes relative to us*; in his *Scripture Doctrine*, p. 372. and that there are degrees of Worship to the several Persons upon the Account of their *respective Characters, Powers and Offices*, p. 415. that the Worship paid to the Son is an *inferior Worship* given Him in these last Days, since his Exaltation, p. 368. I cannot but fear that this is the Reviving the *Doctrine of Demons*, [*Νιδασκαλίας Δαιμονίων*, 1 Tim. iv. 1.] and that we may go on to the Worship of *Angels, Archangels, Thrones, Principalities, &c.* according to their *respective Characters, Powers, and Offices*. To this it has been answer'd on behalf of Dr. Cl—— that these *Angels and Archangels, &c.* are *Creatures*, *ἐξ ἐκ τῶν*. And I must needs say, that if the Son and *Holy Ghost* be not in the highest Sense *one God* with the Father; if the Generation of the one, and the Procession of the other, be not of *necessity of Nature*, but that they receiv'd their Being by the *arbitrary Will* of the supreme God, then are they to all intents and purposes His *Creatures*, dependent on his Will, and so at an infinite distance from Him; and if they should be suppos'd to receive their pre-
rious

rious Beings *some other Way* than the Angels and other Creatures did, yet if the Worship given to them be not upon the *account of Essence or absolute Attributes*, much less will it be upon account of the *different Manner* of their receiving this Essence and Attributes; but as the Son of God receives a higher Worship upon the *Account* of his higher *Actions and Attributes relative to us*, so may Archangels and Angels receive a lower Worship upon the *Account* of their inferior *Actions and Attributes relative to us*. I know that Dr. Cl— and his Followers, make a difference between *γέννημα* and *ποίημα*, and will own that there is no similitude between the Son of God, and the Angels, or other Creatures: But if you take away the true Difference, *viz.* that *Creation* is an *arbitrary Act*, by which Creatures depend on the Pleasure of God for their Being: and *Generation* is necessary to the Divine Essence, as much as Understanding and Intellect can be; I say, if you take away this difference, the Son of God is brought down to be a proper *ποίημα*, or *action* which we render *Creature*, though they may believe, that there is no similitude between Him and other Creatures. There is no similitude, that I know of, between an *Archangel* and a *Pebblestone* but in this, that they both are *dependent Beings*, at the Will of their Creator: and suppose another Being, as much above an *Archangel* in his Resemblance to the supreme God, in Understanding, Power, &c. as an *Archangel* is above a *Pebblestone*; yet still being *dependent Beings*, they are all *ποίηματα*, at an infinite Distance from their Maker, as dependency is from independency; and must not share in the Worship of the *most High*, nor be joined with Him in the same Prayers and Praises. The supreme God saith, *Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.* This stands in our

way: And if we can break through this, as only meant of the *highest* Degree of Worship, leaving an *inferior* sort to be given to subordinate Beings: What will hinder the *Angels* (when present in our Assemblies) from being the *Object* of our *Worship*, as *commission'd Guardians*, upon the Account of that *Character* and *Relation* that they have to us; which is made the Ground of our *Worship*? and where shall we stop?

III. The only thing that I know of that is urg'd further against our *Scripture-Argument* is, that it is taken from the *Old Testament Texts*, which ought in all Reason to be explain'd by the Texts of the *New Testament*; the Current of which, is produced by Dr. *Clarke*, for the Confirming his Scheme. To which I answer, That the *Texts* of the *New Testament*, cited by Dr. *Clarke*, respect Christ as a Mediator; and have been shewn in the *Preface*, not any ways to oppose our *Argument*, but exactly to agree therewith. And for the *Texts* that we have cited, besides that one of the most unanswerable [*viz.* Matt. iv. 10.] is out of the *New Testament*: I desire it may be also considered, that the *Old Testament* is not only not contrary to the *New*, but is the proper Place from whence the *Characters* of the *Messiah* are to be sought; from whence the antient *Jews* knew that He was the *Son of God*, and equal with the Father. Joh. v. 18. the *Jews* sought to kill Him, because He said, That God was his Father, [*πατέρα ἰδίου*] making himself equal with God. Which Inference, had had no pretence, if it had not been a known thing, that the *Son of God* was of the same *Essence*, and so equal with the Father. For in a lower Sense to say that God was his Father, was no more than what themselves own'd, Joh. viii. 41. The same Inference they made from his saying at another time, *I and my Father are one*; that they went about to

stone Him; because, as they told Him, *Thou being a Man, makest thy self God*, Joh. x. 30, 33. Hence it is that the *New Testament* does continually refer us to the *Old*, and the Texts from thence are meant by the *Scriptures* which we are commanded to search and try in this Matter, Joh. v. 39. *Act.* xvii. 12. And though the *New Testament* has many full Proofs of the *Eternal-Deity* of the *Son*, which are frequently urg'd; yet the Comparing the *Old Testament* with the *New*, does wonderfully confirm this great Truth; when we find the Texts that speak of the *Lord Jehovah*, who is on all Hands own'd to be the *one God*, in the *Old Testament*, to be so expressly apply'd to the *Son of God* in the *New*. I set down before, *Isa.* xlv. 6. compared with *Rev.* i. 8, 11. 17. and *Isa.* xlv. 22, 23. compared with *Rom.* xiv. 10, 11. So we may add, *Zech.* xii. 10. fulfill'd in *Christ*, Joh. xix. 37. *Malachi* iii. 1. compared with *Luk.* i. 76. *Joh.* i. 23. and many other Instances there are; some of which we had not known to have been spoken of the *Son of God*, if they had not been so applied by inspir'd Writers; as *Psal.* cii. 24, 25. which is apply'd to Him, *Heb.* i. 10, 11. and divers of these are such Texts as speak of the *Unity of God*, and that there is no other. So *Isa.* xliii. 11. *Besides me, there is no Saviour*, is just the same with *Acts* iv. 12. *Neither is there Salvation in any other*. When the *Old Testament* calls *Jehovah* the *Shepherd of Israel*; the *Son of God* speaking of Himself, saith, *Joh.* x. 14, ---16. *That there shall be one Fold, and one Shepherd*. The Prophet saith, *Isa.* liv. 5. *Thy Maker is thy Husband, the Lord of Hosts is his Name*. The Apostle saith, *2 Cor.* xi. 2. *I have espoused you to one Husband, that I may present you as a chaste Virgin to Christ*. So far therefore is the *New Testament* from revealing to us any other *Divine Beings*, as Objects

jects of our Worship, than the *Old Testament* did ; that it many ways confirms the *Old Testament Doctrine of one God, and none besides Him* ; and that the *one God, is not one Person, but three Persons in one Substance or Essence.*

But Dr. Clarke taking the Words *Person* and *Being* to be of the same Signification, (See his Book, Part II. §. I.) has found out an *Epithet* that may be indifferently apply'd to either of those Words ; and many, I fear, are misled by the ambiguous Use of it. This is the Term *Self-existent* in this Proposition, *The Father only is Self-existent* ; which being misunderstood, is easily altered into this, that *the Father alone is the Self-existent Being* ; and from thence they conclude, that the *Son* and *Spirit* must be distinct, derived, and dependent Beings. (*Three Letters to Dr. Clarke, p. 11.*) It is necessary therefore to remove the *Ambiguity* of this Word. *Self-existent* is either, 1. A *personal Property*, and the same with *Unbegotten*. Thus the Doctor translates *Ἀγέννητος*, *Self-existent*. (*Scripture Doctrine, p. 274.*) In this Sense, no doubt, the *Father alone is, ἐκ' ἑωυτοῦ*, of no other Person ; for He is the *first Person*, and the other two Persons are of Him. Or it is, 2. an *essential Attribute*, and the same with *Necessarily-existent*. Thus the Doctor speaks of the *Self-existent Substance*, (*Ibid. §. XIV. p. 276.*) In this Sense it belongs to all the *Three Persons* in that *one Substance* ; in which *Trinity* none is *afore* or *after* other ; none is *greater* or *less* than another : but the whole *Three Persons* are *coeternal* together, and *coequal*.

Hymn in the
Liturgy, at
the Ordination
of Priests.

To God the Father Land and Praise,
And to His blessed Son,
And to the Holy Spirit of Grace,
Coequal Three in One.

cent
Te-
das
er
ES-

son
dee
pi-
ei-
are
is
be
un-
Fa-
om
ust
gs.
te-
is
re-
he
re
he
i
vo
al
x-
x-
In
r-
ty
er
r-